After 5 Years of Study, the Air Force Finds That Russians Like Socialism, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. III, NUMBER 7 MARCH 7, 1955 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

In the Wake of Dulles's Mischief-Making Tour

Dangerous War Crisis Ahead

The Bangkok meeting was a curtain-raiser for a new war crisis in the Formosa straits. It would be easy to poke fun at the pompous inanities of Mr. Dulles's opening statement. "Freedom," he said, "cannot thrive in an environment that is hostile to freedom." Someone should have reminded him that in the whole Western hemisphere south of the U.S. border there are only three free countries—Costa Rica, Mexico and Uruguay—and all of them conspicuously suffer from a lack of U.S. friendliness. The Secretary was speaking in the capital of the most ancient absolutism in Asia, whose name he discovered means "land of the free." The only thing free about Thailand then is its etymology. This claptrap becomes meaningful only if translated into what Mr. Dulles really means by freedom, and that is freedom for capitalist exploitation.

But his main purpose was not to declare a new Dulles version of the Monroe Doctrine, extended now to Southeast Asia. He was engaged in a subtler task, and that was to draw the SEATO powers into the defense of Formosa. This is exactly what they tried to avoid at Manila. Formosa was pointedly excluded from the orbit of SEATO. But at Bangkok the U.S. opposed the establishment of a SEATO military force. Mr. Dulles instead tried to sell the idea that the Manila pact was interlocked with our mutual security pacts with Chiang, Syngman Rhee and Japan—and that Southeast Asia must rely if attacked on counter-action from these other areas. This is to link the fate of Singapore with the fate of Formosa. Thus Mr. Dulles set out to do what Knowland has been demanding, and that is to make the British underwrite Chiang.

Why the Atrocity Report Now?

Mr. Dulles may yet succeed. The release in London last week-end of the report on atrocities against British prisoners of war is regarded here as a sign that the British are beginning to give in and to prepare public opinion for possible involvement in war with China. The reliability of these atrocity stories cannot be judged on the basis of the meagre cable summaries. That the North Koreans (like the South) were guilty of savage atrocities in the first phase of the war is indisputable. That conditions improved when the Chinese intervened was long ago attested, among others by MacArthur. It is the timing which is significant. A sensational rehash can serve only to inflame British public opinion.

A showdown is shaping up over the offshore islands. U.S. intelligence in Tokyo reports a Soviet build-up of Chinese air strength opposite the Formosa straits. A Russian air marshal, Zhavoronkov, reputed to be a bombing expert, is said to be in charge; several hundred Russian warplanes have been delivered within the past fortnight; these include, according to last week's issue of the *Sunday Times* of London "the first deliveries of Mig 17s, the Soviet's latest twin-jet radar-equipped fighter-bomber." The Pentagon and Chiang's headquarters in Taipeh are quick enough to give out information of this kind, reliable or not, when they wish to alarm the American public. It is disturbing that little of these circumstantial reports have been carried in the American press. It could be that when the threat is real, Chiang and the war-hawks prefer not to arouse anxiety.

Richards, Then, Was an "Appeaser"

Congress was included in setting the stage for war. The chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, James P. Richards, of South Carolina, attacked the British for trying to "soften up" our policy on Formosa, and the Eisenhower Administration for preparing to back down on Quemoy and Matsu. Like Knowland and Dulles, this Richards (see his admission during the Formosa debate on January 25) was for "appeasing" the Nazis before the war. This pressure from Congress is what the war hawks need. Constantine Brown in the *Washington Star* last Tuesday reported an attack on the offshore islands expected in 30 days and said that "unless there is an 11th hour switch," i.e., by the White House "all measures have already been taken" for U.S. forces to protect Quemoy and Matsu.

Mr. Dulles was due in Taipeh for what was being billed as the biggest war council the U.S. military have ever held with Chiang. On the other side of the world, Churchill (like R. H. S. Crossman in last week's *New Statesman*) defended the fateful British decision to make the H-bomb on the curious ground that it is needed not just to deter the Russians but to restrain the Americans! "I cannot feel," Churchill told the Commons in a revealing passage, "that we should have much influence over their [i.e. U.S.] policy or actions, wise or unwise, while we are largely dependent, as we are today, upon their protection."

But Churchill's possibly optimistic estimates are already being seized on here to build up opinion for preventive war. The State Department fed the Associated Press a long "dope" story hinting that by 1959 Russia may be able to practice "diplomacy by ultimatum" and therefore maybe it would be better to precipitate a showdown at "the next step of U.S. and allied policy now in prospect . . . that of the Chinese coastal islands." This is how Radford thinks. When Churchill told the Commons, rational calculation might be upset by "lunatics or dictators," he should have added admirals.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If We Can't Change Russia by War, Why Not Try Living With It in Peace?

The Real Question (Unanswered) By That 5-Year Air Force Study

The average American has been conditioned by now to think of Russia as a huge "slave state," in which helpless millions are only waiting for the U.S. Marines to land before turning on their handful of oppressors in the Kremlin. For our military and big business elite—if you look closely you'll see we have one—a more sophisticated picture is in process of preparation. *Nation's Business,* organ of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce (by subscription only), gave its readers a preview in its March, 1955, issue, "What Will Russia Do Next?" The curtain-lifter does not answer that question (we suspect the Politbureau itself would be grateful if it did), but it does puncture many pipe-dreams about the Soviet system.

The preview is of one of those grandiose surveys financed by the military, in this case the Air Force, in that manner to which our poor scholars are totally unaccustomed. (What wonders might be achieved if, for once, some peaceful study in human frailty might be organized and bank-rolled in the Medicean grandeur of these studies in preparations for war!) For five years a whole battalion of Russian "experts" have been working out of Harvard on "Strategic Psychological Strengths and Vulnerabilities of the Soviet Social System." The unprocessed data total 33,000 pages; Dr. Clyde Kluckhohn was the director; the results will not be in final shape until this summer. Safe bet: few will ever read it, and those portions which conflict with our dominant respectable stereotypes about the U.S.S.R. will leave no permanent impression.

Double Hedge Against Objectivity

The study is doubly hedged against an objective, in the sense of comprehensive and balanced, view of Russia. 1. It is based largely on interviews in 1950-51 with Soviet citizens who had fled their native land, and is thus subject to exactly the same kind of distortions as if the Russians depended (as in a sense they do) for their view of America on the interrogation of Smith Act victims. 2. The scholars hired by the Air Force were certainly cleared for "loyalty," i.e., for the possession of the proper political preconceptions, so that no scholar who might look on the U.S.S.R. with friendly eyes would knowingly be employed. Hatred is not always the best lens for good vision.

The purpose of the study, of course, is to determine how to defeat Russia in a war, and what to do with it if we win. From this point of view, the study had the temerity and honesty to arrive at some pretty unpalatable conclusions. Here are a few of the questions asked by *Nation's Business* of the Air Force official in charge, and his answers.

Are the Russian people likely to revolt? "No. There is scant evidence for the view that more than a very tiny part of the population would take appreciable risks to sabotage the regime or to aid Western democracy." Do the people resent the Soviet leaders or the Soviet system? "Their hostility is to the regime—the actual people in power—rather than toward the system. *Even those who are violently anti-Soviet favor state ownership of means of production, and other institutional features which are associated with socialism.*" What features of Soviet leadership receive widespread approval? "The people like the purposefulness, the activism, and the steady looking to the future."

They Like Socialism!

In other words, to put it more bluntly, the Soviet citizen dislikes dictatorship but does like socialism. The Marines will not find the U.S.S.R. ripe for free enterprise. This is not too unexpected an observation. More thoughtful observers like George Kennan have been trying unsuccessfully for some time to register this fact on American thinking.

Nor did the Air Force study find the Russians ruled by monsters. "The goal—and to some extent the attainment—of the elite is the rather puritanical 'new Soviet man': disciplined, working steadily and consistently, subordinating personal conduct and motivation to the requirements of Party discipline." Perhaps the naivest question of all was whether the Soviet regime could "completely disregard the wishes and the welfare of the people." The answer: "No. Since the individual is the most flexible resource of the Soviet system, the regime is necessarily concerned with the morale of the population . . ."

When and if the Marines land, they will also find several strikes against them on another score: the Soviet citizens' view of America. This cannot be attributed purely to propaganda, for "overwhelmingly from intellectual emigres" the Air Force students heard "Americans are materialistic and lack spiritual values." (*Time* magazine's theological thumb-sucking apparently failed to impress them.) The Soviet citizen also thinks America "aggressive and bent on world domination." (H-bombs will not eradicate this impression.) But—and this could be important for the future—they still dissociate the American government "from two symbols which Soviet citizens still value: the American people and Franklin D. Roosevelt."

HEARST'S VIEW

"As long as they, the Soviet leaders, feel they are not going to be directly attacked, as long as they know they cannot themselves attack without the certainty of swift and terrible retaliation, I seriously doubt that they will deliberately precipitate a conflict with the West."

—W. R. Hearst, Jr., reporting on his trip to Moscow, New York Journal American, Feb. 28.

Non-Air Force Conclusions

The Air Force findings lead to conclusions it does not make, for these have to do with peace and not war. The first is that, against this background, war would only unite the Soviet peoples more firmly against us, and confirm their suspicions. Socialism is there to stay (except among the peasantry, the "oppressed class" of the U.S.S.R., which hates collective farming, according to those findings). Even if by some miracle in this nuclear age we could take over Russia intact, there is no reason to believe we could remold it in our own image; what we cannot do in tiny Guatemala or South Korea, we can hardly accomplish with the vast bulk of the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. has its problems, very difficult ones, and its discontents, very real ones, but the Russians will have to work them out for themselves. We cannot use them as leverage against the regime. "Expectations are low," the study reported of the people, "and there is also still sufficient belief in the reality of 'capitalist aggression' to make the people satisfied with small concessions."

Hatred, economic warfare, "containment," the ring of hostile bases—these merely confirm in Soviet minds what they have been conditioned to believe of the outside world, not just by "propaganda" but by bitter history since the Revolution. But they would be surprised by a change of tactics. One of the main psychological weaknesses, the Air Force study found, is "To actions by the United States, whether of an economic, military or psychological warfare nature, which are unexpected by the Soviet leaders, and hence disturbing to their confidence that their calculations about us are sound." A reversion to friendly policies would really upset those calculations. There is much in these findings which could be used to create an adult, pragmatic and charitable view of the Soviet Union, and to buttress the case for co-existence—and, indeed, for the practice in our relations with Russia of just a little of that Christian spirit we talk about *ad nauseam.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Blush for Rogge

Those of us who are old friends of O. John Rogge will blush to see him turn up again as witness for the State against the hounded radicals of our time. His appearance in the New York State investigation of the Civil Rights Congress and his testimony about the Case of the Trenton Six recall the ignominious role he played in the unsuccessful prosecution of W. E. B. du Bois, the noted Negro historian. The Congress, the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee and the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born have all given much help in their time to poor people in distress. Whatever our political differences, it is not honorable to join in their persecution. Their officers in refusing to reveal their records are protecting others from the public pillory and deserve credit for their courage.

"Need, Not Greed . . ."

For once we agreed with Senator Byrd. The Virginian was the only Senator to protest when the scandal-ridden FHA's authority to insure mortgages was raised by another one and a half billion dollars. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee piously warned FHA to "observe adequate safeguards" against misuse and to make "need, not greed," its standard. But everybody knows what lush pickings in jerry-built over-priced housing this will provide. Byrd pointed out that since 1933 the Federal government has underwritten domestic housing to a gross total of more than 61 billions. He did not point out that his own charts showed only 70 millions went for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. Subsidies for low-cost public housing were difficult to obtain even in New Deal days. But how easy to get billions in Federal credit for high-cost housing, so long as gravy drips from it into private pockets.

Sharecropper News

Senator Morse put into the Congressional Record for February 25 the annual report for 1945 of the National Sharecroppers Fund with two startling items in it. Some 3,000 small Louisiana strawberry growers "whose average yearly earnings from strawberries were less than $400" tried to market their products more profitably through an AFL union. They were convicted under the Sherman Act of being a strawberry trust and their leader fined $5,000 and given a suspended sentence of one year in jail. (No capitalist has ever gone to jail for violation of the anti-trust laws.) The other item, also out of Louisiana, concerned 2,000 sugar cane workers (average yearly *family* earnings, $700 to $1,200) who formed an AFL union and went on strike. The strike was broken by an injunction which the State's Supreme Court upheld with this ruling, "The guaranties of freedom of speech, even if picketing and speech are held to be identical, cannot be maintained in the face of such irreparable injury to property." The case is being appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Lehman-Celler Bill

Lehman in the Senate and Celler in the House, with an impressive list of co-sponsors, have again taken up the task of repealing the McCarran-Walter Act and reforming our immigration and naturalization laws. Their bill, 214 pages long, represents a massive task of purification. It would—among many other things—repeal the racialistic national origins quota system written into our law in 1924 under the influence of Nordic superiority theories like those of Hitler's; set up a board of Immigration and Visa Appeals to give immigrants and visitors some protection against arbitrary and ignorant consular officials; and liberalize the naturalization laws. In particular it would repeal that Eisenhower Administration monstrosity, the Ferguson - Brownell bill (which even McCarran and Walter derided as unconstitutional). Under this measure, as passed last year, we could for the first time in our history deprive native-born radicals of their citizenship on conviction under the Smith Act and make them—sinister phrase—Stateless persons.

Turning the Tables on an Inquisitor

It is pleasant to report that Albert F. Canwell, who flourished some years back as the Martin Dies and Joe McCarthy of the State of Washington, is in serious trouble for contempt of the State legislature. A joint resolution had ordered him to turn over to the FBI the records of the 1947-49 State Un-American Activities Committee of which he was chairman. This was the committee whose use of informers like George Hewitt helped ruin several good teachers at the University of Washington. Canwell admitted recently at a legislative hearing that he had destroyed some of the records but refused to disclose what happened to the rest.

Harry Bridges' Fifth

On instructions from Washington, U.S. Attorney Lynn E. Gillard in San Francisco has withdrawn his agreement to a stipulation that Harry Bridges' ideas and beliefs were not an issue in the forthcoming *fifth* attempt to deport him. Bridges goes on trial again June 20 for denaturalization proceedings. "If the government can't prove that Bridges is or ever was a member of the Communist party," his lawyer, Richard Gladstein commented, "and nobody has ever been able to prove that—will it then proceed to drag in everything he has ever written, and try him for ideas of which the government doesn't approve?"

Culture and Freedom Note

The February 28 issue of the *New Republic* carried news that deserves a wider audience. David Riesman, author of "The Lonely Crowd," has resigned from the executive committee of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom because it spent too much of its energies in "the vindicative pursuit of 'liberals who haven't learned.'" Riesman broke the news in dissasociating himself from a letter sent by the Committee's executive secretary, Sol Stein, a kind of pygmy anti-Communist Commissar, criticizing the *New Republic* for an article defending Owen Lattimore. Stein's letter praised the McCarran committee, but whether for its contribution to culture or freedom was not clear.

Let's All Die for Formosa

The apocalyptic plane on which the China Lobby and a certain kind of American Catholic thinker meet may be studied in an article from the October 1954 issue of Notre Dame's *Review of Politics* put into the Congressional Record February 25 by Senator Knowland. The writer, using the pen name *Ferreus*, argues the case for preventive war. His "14 Fundamental Facts of the Nuclear Age" lead up to the conclusion that "the time may come when a dispassionate survey of the security problems of the free world "would show that they could not be solved "except through the deliberate resort to force." This may be finish for all of us "but it hardly pays," says *Ferreus*, clinging to a safe anonymity in the meantime, "to survive for the blessings of a slave existence."

Salute to a Hero

Last Monday, with Black and Douglas dissenting, the Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal of George Anastaplo, a World War II Air Force officer, who was denied admission to the bar in Illinois because (1) he refused on principle to say whether he was a Communist and (2) he insisted that people have a right to overthrow an oppressive government. The Court's action ends his hope of becoming a lawyer. Anastaplo, a man with the highest scholastic and character references, is a philosophical libertarian. One of his teachers said of him, "He has one of the two most brilliant minds I have ever taught. His moral standards are impregnable." His is the ancient breed of Patrick Henry and John Lilburne for which there is little place in the deadly conformity of cold war America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Wake of Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley's Retirement as Travel Czarina

Two New Passport Decisions Put Cracks In Our Iron Curtain

Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley took over control of the State Department's passport office in June 1928. By the time of her retirement a few days ago she had become Washington's most feared bureaucrat. Long before the McCarran Act in 1950 forbade the issuance of passports to Communists, Mrs. Shipley had cast a baleful eye on the left-of-center. On more than one occasion during the war FDR himself had to intervene to obtain passports for New Deal civil servants assigned to work abroad but unable to obtain passports because to Mrs. Shipley's eye pink and red were indistinguishable.

No one practiced more deftly than Mrs. Shipley the finest of the State Department's arts—the art of governing negatively by failing to answer communications, mislaying papers, etc. Many simply did not travel abroad because their applications were never acted upon. A long list of other assorted Leftists and radicals had their passports lifted or denied. Under Mrs. Shipley, an Iron Curtain was erected which made it almost as hard for dissenters to get out of the U.S.A. as to get out of the U.S.S.R.

Cracks in the Curtain

Within a few days of Mrs. Shipley's retirement, cracks were opened in that curtain by twin decisions handed down here last Monday by Federal Judge H. A. Schweinhaut in two passport suits against the State Department. One was brought by Professor Otto Nathan, the economist; the other by former Judge William Clark. The two cases, though widely dissimilar, were decided together on the common ground that neither had been given a genuine hearing.

The effect is to upset the kangaroo court passport procedure established by the Department in the wake of the *Bauer* case, when it was held that a passport could not be denied without "due process." The Department thereupon set up an elaborate regulation designed to cover "persons supporting the Communist movement" and "persons likely to violate [security] laws of the United States" while abroad. The procedure was the vague one of a loyalty proceeding, with no right to confront accusers.

"The Law's Delay"

In Otto Nathan's case, he applied for a passport in December, 1952. "After several months of informal interrogation and correspondence," as Judge Schweinhaut describes it, "he was in July, 1954, denied a passport." Prof. Nathan was accused of having once been a Communist in Germany during the 20's. This he denied under oath. A chance to confront his accusers was not granted. "The plaintiff," the Judge ruled, "did not have a hearing which the law contemplates and guarantees."

The government had asked for the dismissal of Nathan's action on the ground, among others, that he had not appealed to the Board of Passport Appeals set up by the 1952 regulations. Nathan pleaded that in the absence of a real hearing there was no point in such an appeal. The Judge agreed. "It does not satisfy me to argue," he ruled, "that the plaintiff has not exhausted his administrative remedies since I thin. as a matter of practical fact he had none."

The Price of a Passport

The same principle was applied by the Judge to the Clark case, though here it is somewhat confusing. Judge Clark did not claim lack of a proper hearing. He produced a letter from Scott McLeod saying that he could have a passport if he promised while abroad not to criticize American policy in Germany. Clark, as a judge of the American occupation courts, had been critical of State Department policy, and had thereupon been denied judicial reappointment.

In Clark's case the Department quite baldly and boldly had asserted what it has so often done privately in passport cases —made it clear that an American citizen whose opinions it disliked must promise to foreswear his right of free speech if he wanted to enjoy the right to travel. This was the hint dropped to Corliss Lamont and this was the clear implication of the decision which wrecked Paul Robeson's livelihood as an international concert star. The only difference is that Clark is not a left-winger.

Less Right Than Communists

The Clark decision may have one peripheral benefit. Until now the Department has ruled that if a person is not suspected of being a Communist, he does not come under the new regulations—and therefore no hearing need be granted him if *his* passport is denied.

Thus in a third passport case, that of Max Schachtman, now awaiting decision in the Circuit Court of Appeals here, he was denied a passport because the Independent Socialist League he heads is on the Attorney General's list. The Department argued that it did not have to give Schachtman a hearing since it did not suspect him of being a Communist! This is the kind of passport wonderland our retiring Alice helped to create.

If You Have Not Yet Renewed, Please Do So Now and Send a Gift Sub to a Friend

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name_____

Street_____

City _____ Zone____ State____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name_____

Street_____

City _____ Zone____ State____

* $1 extra for Canada. 3/7/55

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED